Camouflage in the Twenty-first century is a subject and practice of military science, biological science, culture and society. All are contexts in which concealment and deception—the conceptual underpinnings of camouflage—find physical, visual and psychological expression. Camouflage’s ever-increasing associations today with war, nature, and everyday life are apparent in the global escalation of national military patterns, in intensifying interest in the chemistry and physics of animal behaviours and colours, in expanding cooption of military aesthetics for street fashion, and in the growing popularity of camouflage as a conceptual tool for cultural analysis. The word itself gradually spread from French into all languages after the First World War (WWI) when France, the first nation in military history, established a formal section de camouflage. By 1925, ‘camouflage’ was increasingly used to identify animal concealment and deception, science’s terminology having become enmeshed with military lingo. Before the war, however, common biological terms were ‘mimicry’ and ‘concealing coloration’, indeed the very terms and natural phenomena that were brought to military attention by naturalists and scientists, including Abbott H. Thayer, for the development of camouflage in WWI.

This essay is about intersections of nature, art and war but with an emphasis on how post-war European art was impacted by what Paul Fussell called ‘the new stylish foreign word camouflage’ and also by camouflage aesthetics. Roy R. Behrens has written extensively on this subject, but Behrens aside there is surprisingly little
investigation of camouflage in relation to the European avantgarde of the 1920s and 1930s. This deficiency is especially noticeable in relation to the very camouflage-inclined aesthetics of the post-war movement Surrealism. For example, the central aesthetic and psychological predilections of Surrealism—doubling, displacement, and metamorphosis—all have parallels in camouflage tactics developed in WWI. Further, two surrealist obsessions were metaphors and dreams, both of which operate through the camouflage principles of disguise, concealment and deception. In 2008 Michael Taussig proposed that the relatively slight interest in Surrealism and camouflage is due to an anxiety at ‘the merging of the artist with the art of war’.

Indeed artists in the movement of Surrealism were famously anti-war. André Breton, for example, was fascinated by the visual deceptions of nature but he seldom used the word ‘camouflage’, although an exception is the Prolegomena to a Third Surrealist Manifesto (1942) in the context of animal mimicry. Given the martial rhetoric of the word ‘camouflage’ compared with ‘mimicry’ it seems reasonable to suppose that the intonation of ‘camouflage’ did not suit Breton’s anti-war activism, this being a major part of his international identity as far afield as Australia where in 1941 he published the following response to the Second World War (WWII):

Human thought is humiliated in the sense that it is compelled to note, to affirm, from day to day, a series of events which do not have any bearing at all upon rational intelligence, and which are related solely to barbarism.

Rather than ‘camouflage’, Breton and his associates throughout the 1920s and 1930, including writer and sociologist Roger Caillois, favoured the older terminology ‘mimicry’ used by nineteenth century naturalists Charles Darwin and Alfred Wallace. And as a result of their predilection for biological rather than military terminology, the literature on Surrealism also emphasises the term ‘mimicry’.

The subject of Surrealism and camouflage requires two approaches: first the affect of military camouflage on surrealists, and secondly the design and theorisation of military camouflage by surrealists. Relevant to the second approach are Salvador Dalí, Roland Penrose and Arshile Gorky, although I focus here on Dalí who interweaves theories of animal and military camouflage with commentary on the paranoiac-critical theory of his own painting and in the process demonstrates how art, nature and war are impossible to disentangle. The first approach, however, requires speculation on the visual and mental impact of camouflage, as experienced
in the war landscape, on surrealist art, and I consider this through the case of Max Ernst.

**The First World War**

A French ministerial order established the first official camouflage unit in 1915 to aid in the concealment of soldiers and military equipment, and the first soldiers assigned this work were artists. The unit’s mascot was the chameleon, an animal that later featured, along with the praying mantis, in artist Kurt Seligmann’s 1938 montage of surrealist animals published in André Breton’s *A Short Guide to Surrealism (Dictionnaire Abrégé du Surréalisme).* Among French artists enlisted in WWI, the idea of working in the camouflage division was attractive, yet it was also competitive and Fernand Léger was disappointed to be refused that opportunity.

With military camouflage having made an impact on a generation of artists who fought in WWI it was inevitable that its memory and mystique would find new forms of expression in post-war society, as it did in popular culture. French children’s story-writer Jean de Brunhoff invented a much-loved tale of elephants at war with rhinos and of elephants outwitting their enemies with camouflage, a tale set in landscapes resembling the battlefields of WWI on which Jean de Brunhoff fought. In *The Travels of Babar* (1934) the author exploited the comical idea of animals inventing camouflage for human-style warfare even though concealment and deception is their natural domain. The story is an example of what Margot Norris addresses in her introduction to *Beasts of the Modern Imagination* (1985), that of animals in literature as ‘protagonists reappropriating their animality amid an anthropocentric universe’. Not lost on de Brunhoff, in the wake of WWI, was the intense interest in camouflage that war engendered and the inevitable intersection of nature, art and war in its future representations.
Surrealism emerged in the 1920s in reaction to a western military culture that fetishized camouflage like none before. Never before had militaries in France, Germany, Britain and the United States included camouflage units in warfare, and never before had abstraction and trompe l’oeil played such a big part in war aesthetics. This point is made emphatically by Elizabeth Kahn, the first art historian to address the subject of WWI and camouflage and its impact on the European avantgarde. Concealment and deception, in intellectual and organic forms, became central to Surrealism through two intellectual channels. First through Darwin’s theory that through natural selection animals evolved physiological attributes to conceal themselves and deceive predators. Second, through Freud’s theory that the unconscious is a defence mechanism for concealing and disguising traumatic memories. But surrealists were also of a generation that was startled by the sudden proliferation of disguise and trickery in military weaponry, including the never-before-seen nonsensical black and white patterns of disruptive camouflage known as ‘dazzle’ on warships, one source of which was cubism and modern art.
Natural Camouflage

It was in WWI when animal camouflage, together with modern and academic art, served as models for modern weapons of subterfuge, that the word ‘camouflage’ became more widely used to refer to natural concealment and deception, in place of nineteenth century naturalist terminology. William Pycraft, a British zoologist, whose book, *Camouflage in Nature* (1925), was among the first to incorporate the word camouflage in a book title, explained the historical circumstance:

... this new word in our language was adopted as a convenient substitute for “obliterative coloration” or “protective coloration”, which, at that time, would have been exasperatingly elusive. We had no time then, and were in no mood, to devote precious energies to the discussion of the niceties of etymology.20

Pycraft’s reference to ‘obliterative coloration’ and ‘protective coloration’ refer to a theory that animals are universally coloured dark on top and light underneath since when light strikes them from above an optical effect flattens their form and the animals seemingly disappear, or so it was argued by the source of this theory, American naturalist and artist Abbott H. Thayer in *Concealing-Coloration In the Animal Kingdom* (1909).21 Ultimately, however, it was Charles Darwin, Alfred Russel Wallace and Henry Walter Bates who put forward foundational ideas on biological camouflage and who drew attention to the way non-human animals are unmatched as creatures of invisibility, visual surprise, uncanny duplication, and metamorphosis. Their ideas were later expanded and contested by amateur and professional scientists including Fritz Müller and Ernst Haeckel in Germany, Edward Poulton, Hugh B. Cott and Pycraft in Britain, and Thayer in the US.

Darwin devised a theory of imitation that showed that all life—plant and animal—rather than only human life, is mimetic.22 In the first edition of *The Origin of Species* (1859) he argued that the ‘tints’ of animals are not useless and trivial decorative details, but allow the animal to be concealed from visual detection by others, thereby offering a protective adaptation that is the outcome of natural selection.23 But in 1872, in the 6th Edition and with greater influence from Alfred Wallace, he devised a more detailed description of mimicry, singling out for special mention insects that resemble, in form and colour, a variety of objects including ‘green or decayed leaves’.24 Wallace too marvelled at the mimicry of the walking-leaf insect and wrote of the endless fascination that such animals’ ‘strange disguises as vegetable or mineral substances’ would present to future scientists. His
prediction came true for Hugh Cott whose portrait-like photographs of walking-leaf insects are among the most beautiful in natural history illustration (fig. 1). But Wallace could not have known that sixty years later his prediction would also come true for artists and that Surrealism would be equally inspired by nature’s morphic transformations.

Surrealism’s passion for animal camouflage turned its artists into amateur naturalists. Walking-leaf insects entranced Salvador Dalí as much as they had Darwin, Wallace and Cott, and what struck the artist more than anything about the animal’s mimicry of a leaf was its ability to be visible and invisible simultaneously, to be seen but not recognised, and paradoxically to escape unwarranted attention while still being in full view. As Dalí put it, this is what happens when ‘reality playing at illusion becomes illusion’ and his description of the insect demonstrates his captivation:

Some of them not only take on the exact form and color of leaves, but even imitate their slightest surface conformations—tiny holes corresponding to drops of water pierced by a ray of sunlight, gossamer traces of mildew, the notched edges made by the gnawing of certain insects.

The ocelli on a moth’s wings, the flower shape of insects, the insect shapes of flowers, the seemingly animal, vegetable and mineral nature of coral, all supplied puzzles for the surrealist mind as well as the eye, calling the certainty of sight and powers of reasoning into question and offering countless exotic examples of form in unstable states of transformation.
Extraordinary examples of animal mimicry were increasingly available through the public press and popular magazines including *Nature* and *National Geographic* and in books by Thayer, Cott and Pycraft. Dalí, for example, was familiar with a well-known scientific experiment conducted on a flat fish (a sole) which he may have seen illustrated in Pycraft’s book (fig. 2). When placed on a chequered background the fish, by changing its chromatophores was able to assimilate with its surroundings by becoming chequered. What excited Dalí was how the sole became ‘invisible to the most knowing eye’. What intrigued Pycraft about mimicry of this type was how ‘the living body comes to assume a likeness to inanimate objects—to leaves, flowers, or twigs, or to other animals’. The difference between the response of the surrealist and the scientist is only slight. Indeed the visual effect of the fish undergoing cellular transformation bears some similarity with the molecular aesthetics of Dalí’s later work *The disintegration of the persistence of memory* (1952-54).

In Surrealism’s artistic legacy living bodies are regularly depicted assuming likenesses to inanimate objects, and vice versa. The interplay of animate and inanimate is constant, but three examples are the metamorphosis imagery in Dalí’s
The Metamorphosis of Narcissus (1937), Meret Oppenheim’s Fur-Covered Cup, Saucer and Spoon (1936), and René Magritte’s Discovery (1928).
The poetic and psychological power of natural camouflage including animal mimicry, its rightness for Surrealism, an art form of paradox and irony, is exemplified by Magritte’s painting *Discovery* (fig. 3). Through a veneer of dark striations that at one level signify the deceptions of woman, Magritte places the feminine psyche in a realm of primitive shadow and changeability. The shadowy marks that represent equally the slope of the grain in wood, and the disruptive patterns of reptiles, turn the human form into a tangled complication of nature. What is flaunted here is not just a double life, as in Magritte’s paintings within paintings, but indeterminate biological identity.

**Man as Animal**

The question of man as animal, an interrogation that underlies all surrealist art, was raised urgently in WWI. The savagery of people, their descent to barbarism, became the key symbolic frame through which to discuss that war. Consequently Paul Fussell referred to the underground world of trenches as the ‘troglodyte’ world. Elizabeth Kahn described them as the ‘animal world’. And base animality is evoked in André Breton’s poem, *War*, written during WWII but dedicated to Max Ernst, a survivor of the trenches of WWI. It begins with a reference to man as Beast:

```plaintext
I watch the Beast as it licks itself
The better to blend into all of its surroundings
Its eyes the color of heavy seas
```

By blending—by camouflaging itself—the Beast can see but cannot be seen. This menacing force is not man as animal in the sense of a magical being, but man as monster. Many who witnessed WWI argued the war was evidence of human biological destiny, and that men in war, by necessity, return to a primitive state of nature brought about by the struggle for survival. Instinct theory and the concept of the beast within were prevalent in all fields, including biology. The First World War therefore suggested a lack of distinction between animal and human in a way that frightened and repulsed because it showed the brutish, savage animal that evolution was meant to have overcome through natural selection and civilization.
Trenches

The fact that the war was fought in trenches below the ground, in a subterranean world where animals live and hide, was taken as proof that human life had regressed. Significantly for the trajectory of this discussion, the trenches were camouflage devices, in fact the most ubiquitous of all camouflage devices in WWI (fig. 4). They forced concealment and deception, and invisibility, to become embodied experiences for those confined to them. Max Ernst was among the thousands buried in the disorientating maze of trenches. Art historians have struggled to adequately represent the sublimity of WWI but Richard Cork warns not to underestimate the traumatic impact of trench warfare and military service on artists, nor the extraordinary imagination that was the outcome of the sublimation of that horror.36

Max Ernst wrote of the experience as ‘four years of mud and blood’.37 So traumatic was this episode in his life that Roland Penrose suggested, when writing an introduction to an exhibition of the series *Histoire Naturelle* that ‘having survived the insane misery of the 1914-1918 war’ explains Ernst’s entire oeuvre.38 The artist explained that series of frottages as the collapse of physical and psychological distinctions of nature into ‘optical hallucinations’.39 But as in other works by Ernst such as *Petrified Forest* (fig. 5), the images in *Histoire Naturelle* share a claustrophobic, close-up vertical aesthetic that suggests the viewpoint of someone looking up; the viewpoint, it could be argued, of soldiers in trenches. As our eyes meet a barrier that pushes upwards to only the merest empty space at the top of the picture frame the resemblance to the walls of trenches is uncanny. Ernst’s works have been interpreted many ways, but against the historical background of war, his frightening and grim *Petrified Forest* takes on the soldier’s perspective of looking up from the slit in the ground, where the bodies of the dead merged with and emerged from the walls of their enclosure, to the sky above.40
Fig. 4, Trench, Fricourt, France, 1917, Australian War Memorial, AWM P01835.043
Fig. 5, Max Ernst, *Petrified Forest*, 1927, The National Museum of Western Art, Tokyo, © Max Ernst/ADAGP. Licensed by Viscopy, 2011.

Fig. 6, Australian Dummy Tanks, France, c. 1916, Australian War Memorial, AWM C04505,
Fig. 7. An observation post at German House, Ploegsteert Wood, Messines sector, Belgium, 2nd February 1918, Australian War Memorial, AWM E04548
Fig. 8, German Army soldiers with tank well-camouflaged, Western Front, October 1918, Australian War Memorial, AWM H13460.

Fig. 9, Europe 1918, a partly camouflage German tank emerging from a wood, Australian War Memorial, AWM H13461.
One writer to associate the aesthetics of camouflage in WWI with Surrealism is Hillel Schwartz. He compares, for example, the mimicry inherent in military decoys—including fake tanks, and observation posts posing as trees complete with simulated peeling bark—with the optical conflicts generated by trompe l’oeil illusions in fine art paintings (figs. 6 & 7). Yet while ally and enemy both made exhibitions of their dummies, hoping to bluff the other through misinformation, their lethal operational machinery was disguised from aerial view beneath coverings of foliage, both natural and fake. Hidden tanks waited to burst forward in explosions of energy with the same shocking impact attributed to convulsive beauty evoked by Breton’s image of a locomotive engulfed by jungle and defined by Roger Cardinal as a fusion of contrasts between ‘the mechanical and the natural, the controlled and the chaotic, the designed and the spontaneous’ (figs 8 & 9). It is not just the contrast between rational technology and chaotic nature that is powerful, but the thought of a sudden propulsion of energy. It is a reminder that while war is a highly structured institution, its operations are often conducted through random, chance, spontaneous, accidental and automatic actions.

Significantly, war and camouflage have been linked both with Surrealism’s birth and its death. James Clifford saw in the startling contradictions, shocking juxtapositions, and disquieting effects of the trenches and battlefields of WWI and in the incomprehensible scale of destruction and death, a beginning point after which ‘the world was permanently surrealist’. But looking at Surrealism through the surreality of WWII British surrealist Julian Trevelyan recognised a sign that Surrealism had been superseded by its appropriation into military camouflage:

It became absurd to compose Surrealist confections when high explosives could do it so much better and when German soldiers with Tommy-guns descended from the clouds on parachutes dressed as nuns. Life had caught up with Surrealism or Surrealism with life, and for a giddy moment we in England lived the irrational movement to its death. Afterwards it could never be the same.

**Dalí and The Second World War**

Yet for Salvador Dalí, military camouflage and Surrealism were much more than exercises in masquerade. When in 1942 he published ‘Total Camouflage For Total War’ in *Esquire* magazine Dalí appeared to embrace war and camouflage as an intellectual and aesthetic challenge for Surrealism. The publication closely followed his expulsion from the central surrealist group and what is startling about
the article, which was written independently of any involvement in military service, is the way it sits ambiguously between condoning political violence and wanting it ended. His contemporary Roland Penrose who also wrote about camouflage for the British Home Guard was unequivocally pacifist before war service, and Arshile Gorky who theorised camouflage for civil defence in New York clearly struggled with his conscience when doing so. Haim Finkelstein’s view is that Dalí’s excursion into camouflage is another example of his subversive force, for although in 1942 he was outside the main surrealist group, he often inflicted damage to it by ‘throwing back mostly his own often idiosyncratic beliefs and attitudes’.45

Picasso’s cubism and harlequin figures Dalí credited with the discoveries of camouflage in WWI, specifically with ‘dazzle’ a camouflage design that visually altered the observer’s perception of the shape, direction, and speed of military objects, primarily ships (fig. 10). But his own surrealist discoveries of psychological camouflage through double-images he believed would prove of paramount ‘utilitarian importance in the field of warfare’ in WWII:

And just as the camouflage of 1914 was Cubist and Picassan, so the camouflage of 1942 should be Surrealist and Dalístic. For this time, the discovery is mine—namely the secret of total invisibility and the psychological camouflage.46

The article’s real purpose is to convey Dalí’s argument that by manipulating and distorting vision through figure-ground interplay, by creating figures from the spaces between forms as he practiced with the paranoiac-critical method, he had invented a means of inducing in an enemy an irrational and imagined real, and an irrational and imagined falsehood. Moreover he had the power to create indeterminate form and render form ‘invisible—without transformation—simply by surrounding it with other images which make the spectator assume he is looking at something else’.47 On the surface, Dalí’s theories appear similar to ones popularized by the earlier Gestalt psychologists.48 Yet he referred to the Gestaltists as ‘people who have hardly understood anything yet of physics’.49 He distanced himself from their rationalization of three-dimensional illusion, and claimed instead a new perception of space and figure-ground relations having ‘a delirious or psychopathological basis’.50 Just as Dalí intended paintings such as The Metamorphosis of Narcissus (1937) to make the irrational concrete through a language of precision and clarity comparable to exterior reality, so he believed his visual rhetoric could help in warfare by controlling the enemy’s vision, and paralysing it (fig. 11).51
In ‘Total Camouflage For Total War’ Dalí takes circuitous paths discussing walking-leaf insects, the paranoiac-critical method, and cubism in relation to camouflage, and in the process demonstrates how camouflage crosses boundaries of art, war and nature. But ‘Total Camouflage for Total War’ is not only focussed on military application of the paranoiac-critical method. Dalí was captivated to think that well before human life, at the origins of earthly life when nature was
raw and primitive, when there was no distinction between reality and imagination, and no human warfare, there was still camouflage in the form of animal mimicry, a visual world of doubling. This was proof that his artistic creations possessed a direct link with the primordial past, the unconscious of civilization:

And well before the cave man, even before man appeared at all on the surface of the earth, the same principle reigned in nature, taking the form of that most mysterious and least known phenomena—mimetism. In the beginning.... was camouflage, the invisible! 

When Dalí’s article takes this turn it illustrates how natural science, and mimicry in nature, offered the surrealists a radical perspective on the world. Indeed, animal camouflage became emblematic of the world’s marvellous possibilities if only the everyday could be wrested free of habits of thinking and constrictions in literal and figurative vision. In exile in the United States during WWII, such dreams became increasingly important.

**The Invisible**

Claimed at the outset of this essay was that André Breton’s vocabulary rarely included the word ‘camouflage’, except in the ‘Prolegomena to a Third Surrealist Manifesto’ where he argued for myth as a model for life, the myth of the ‘Great Transparent Ones’ (1942). Breton’s wondrous myth is that human beings live with other beings, higher beings, who camouflage themselves just as mimetic animals do:

One may go so far as to believe that there exists above him on the animal level beings whose behaviour is as alien to him as his own must be to the day fly or the whale. There is nothing that would necessarily prevent such beings completely escaping his sensory frame of reference since these beings might avail themselves of a type of camouflage, which no matter how you might imagine it becomes plausible when you consider the theory of form and what has been discovered about mimetic animals. 

In T. J. Demos’s view Breton’s myth celebrating the idea of invisible entities surrounding human beings, was ‘a way to balance ideological contradictions in a period of extreme compromise’ and was ultimately a means of escape from
fascism, rather than the type of confrontation with it that might be expected of a revolutionary. Jacqueline Chénieux-Gendron, on the other hand, finds in Breton’s opening remark—‘man is perhaps not the center, the cynosure of the universe’—a provocation and invitation to change our anthropomorphic perspective and ‘displace our systems of reference’ that represents a call to action.

Also in 1942 John B. L. Goodwin, surrealist writer, painter, and friend of Max Ernst and Roberto Matta, published ‘Remarks on the Polymorphic Image’ in the New York surrealist magazine *View*. In spirit it compares well with Breton’s ‘Great Transparent Ones’. Goodwin begins by describing at length the marvellous aspects of mimicry in the praying mantis, cuckoos, moths, and zebras and ends by criticising the human will to rationalise and categorise the marvellous in nature, destroying in the process mimicry’s magical dimension. Like Breton he takes the reader into a realm of phantoms and other-worldly creatures who are invisible:

If caterpillars can be unperceived against the grass, who knows what monsters may be indiscernible against the mimicked background of sky, or wall, or waterfall?... Am I not the procryptic colouring of a butterfly, or you the anticryptic colouring of a phantom? Are dreams not cataclysms cloaked in memories?

Goodwin’s writing is a lively, suggestive, intriguing and surrealistic exposition on how our senses deceive us due to habits of seeing and how we are not in a position to presuppose and explain the wonders of animal camouflage within the framework of human knowledge. It is also a poetic reimagining of the world that reiterates the triangular associations of art, nature and war, but this time by bringing camouflage to the world’s regeneration and to war’s protest. Written during WWII, Breton’s and Goodwin’s thinking reflects the increasing despondency of surrealists in revolutionary social politics and an increasing trust in magic and alchemy for transformation and change, states made all the more real by alchemical nature.

Notes
9. Roger Caillois, ‘Mimicry and Legendary Psychasthenia’,translated by John Shepley, No. 31, 1984, p.31; Caillois’s most familiar essay borrows theories of the natural world to explain the social world. Caillois proposed that mimicry is part of the visual awareness of insects and that in fusing with their backgrounds through imitation, which causes them to lose their boundaries or distinction in space, they experience a loss of self comparable to the psychic disturbances know as psychaesthena.
12. Elizabeth Kahn, Lanham; MD, University Press of America, 1984, p.1
13. Roy R. Behrens, , Dysart; Iowa, Bobolink Books, 2009, p.86
15. André Breton, Paris, Galerie Beaux-Arts, 1938
16. Elizabeth Kahn, Lanham; MD, University Press of America, 1984, p.16
31. Elizabeth Kahn, Lanham; MD, University Press of America, 1984, p.31
32. The dedication of ‘War’ to Max Ernst is stated in Mark Polizzotti (Ed), Berkeley, University of California Press, 2003,p.116
33. Jean-Pierre Cauvin and Mary Ann Caws (translated and edited), Boston; Mass, Black Widow Press, 2006, p.223


40. Paul Fussell described the trenches’ towering walls of dirt as affording only glimpses of sky. See Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000 (originally published 1975), p.51

41. Hillel Schwartz, New York, Zone Books, 1996, p.188


55. André Breton, translated by Richard Seaver and Helen R. Lane, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1972, p.293


59. John B. L. Goodwin, ‘Remarks on the Polymorphic Image’, 1, Dec-Jan 1941-1942, p.8


Works Cited


Behrens, Roy R, Dysart; Iowa, Boblink Books, 2009.


Breton, André, translated by Richard Seaver and Helen R. Lane, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1972.

Breton, André, Paris, Galerie Beaux-Arts, 1938.


Cauvin, Jean-Pierre and Caws, Mary Ann (translated and edited), Boston; Mass, Black Widow Press, 2006.


Goodwin, John B. L, ‘Remarks on the Polymorphic Image’, View, 1, Dec-Jan 1941-1942, pp.8-9


Krauss, Rosalind, ‘Corpus Delicti’, Vol. 33, Summer 1985, pp.31-72


**Note:** All visuals are used by permissions. Paid invoices on file with author.

---

**DR. ANN ELIAS,** an associate professor of theoretical enquiry at the SCA, researches Australian art and visual culture, including the concept and examples of camouflage, and the intersection of disciplines between art and science. Her research is included in major international journals including Leonardo, and her book *Camouflage Australia: Art, Nature, Science and War* was published by Sydney University Press in 2011.